

Article claims

With respect to the rejection of claims 36-40, applicant incorporates by reference and repeats his arguments above which relate to the elements (iii) length in combination with (iv) flexibility factor.

For purposes of simplifying examination, applicant does not assert there is novelty in aspect ratio itself, but applicant asserts that in combination with the other features of the claims, a chamber having such ratio defines a novel invention.

Claim 36 and 39 embrace somewhat different embodiments, each for a particular leaching chamber having a combination of properties which is undescribed by Kruger. The combination provides light per-unit-length weight but that factor also make the chamber much more bendable along its length axis, i.e., the chamber has a high flexibility factor. Interrelatedly, such types of chamber resists removal from the top of a stack of nested chambers, but when they are 5.7 feet or less they are removable by a single person.


In the present rejection, (a) each and every element of the claimed chamber is neither disclosed nor implicit in the cited prior art, as required to support a 35 USC 102 rejection; and (b) there is insufficient specificity in the reference to constitute anticipation under 35 USC 102.

Dependent claim 37 ought to at least be allowed as particular embodiments of a patentable invention. Claims 38 and 40 embrace more particular embodiments and thus more unique embodiments, and ought to be allowed for the same reasons as given for the parent claims.

Wherefor, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,
ROY E. MOORE, JR.

By


His Attorney

C. G. Nessler
Box H
Chester, CT 06412
(860) 526-9149
(860) 526-1043